



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

VOLENTINE & WHITT, PLLC
ONE FREEDOM SQUARE,
11951 FREEDOM DRIVE, SUITE 1260
RESTON, VA 20190

7/30/07

In re Application of:

Eriksen, Andre Sloth

Serial No.: 10/578,578

Filed: May 5, 2006

Docket: ASE.001

Title: COOLING SYSTEM FOR A
COMPUTER SYSTEM

DECISION ON PETITION TO
MAKE SPECIAL FOR NEW
APPLICATION UNDER 37
C.F.R. § 1.102 & M.P.E.P. §
708.02 (VIII)

This is a decision on the petition filed on January 29, 2007 requesting reconsideration of the decision on the previous Petition to Make Special under 37 CFR §1.102 & MPEP § 708.02 (VIII) mailed on January 5, 2007. The petition fee of \$130.00 has previously been charged to the Deposit Account provided in the petition.


The petition to make the application special is **GRANTED**.

The petition has been reviewed and is found to be in compliance with the requirements for special status as set forth in Section 708.02 (VIII) of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedures (MPEP).

Applicant is advised that the examiner's search will be restricted to the subject matter encompassed by the claims. In the event that the application receives a first action rejection, Applicant is encouraged to arrange for an interview with the examiner, and to provide the examiner with a working copy of any proposed amendment one working day prior to the interview. Any amendment filed in response to a first action rejection that would require broadening the field of search will be treated as an improper response. See MPEP 708.02 (VIII) for a full explanation of the handling of applications after petition grant.

While Technology Center Directors may have granted petitions that do not comply with the detailed discussion requirement of the Accelerated Examination procedure, Technology Center Director decisions on petitions are not binding precedent of the Patent Examining Corps, and the application of an improper standard in certain cases does not require the Office to continue to apply the improper standard in all cases. See *In re The Boulevard Entertainment, Inc.*, 334 F.3d 1336, 1343, 67 USPQ2d 1475, 1480 (Fed. Cir. 2003).

Petition GRANTED


Henry C. Yuen, Special Programs Examiner
Technology Center 3700 – Mechanical Engineering,
Manufacturing and Products
571-272-4856